1 ROBERT FERGUSON Attorney General of Washington KELLY T. WOOD, WSBA #40067 (pro hac vice pending) 2 3 Assistant Attorney General 800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000 Seattle, WA 98104 Telephone: (206) 326-5494 Fax: (206) 587-5088 4 5 6 KENDALL BRILL & KELLY LLP Laura W. Brill (195889) lbrill@kbkfirm.com 7 Kendall Brill & Kelly LLP 8 10100 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 1725 Los Angeles, CA 90067 9 Telephone: 310.556.2700 Facsimile: 310.556.2705 10 Attorneys for the State of Washington 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 12 WESTERN DIVISION 13 OCEANA, INC., 14 NO. 2:17-cv-05146 RGK-**JEM**x 15 Plaintiff, NOTICE OF MOTION AND 16 MOTION FOR LEAVE TO V. FILE AMICUS CURIAE 17 WILBUR ROSS, in his official BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF capacity as Secretary of the U.S. **PLAINTIFF** Department of Commerce; 18 NATIONAL OCEANIC AND 19 **ATMOSPHERIC** ADMINISTRATION; and NATIONAL MARINE 20 FISHERIES SERVICE, 21 Defendants. 22 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD: 23 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT the State of Washington hereby moves 24 the Court for leave to file a brief amicus curiae in the above-captioned case in 25 26

1

support of Plaintiff. A copy of the proposed *amicus* brief is attached as an exhibit to this motion.

I. LEGAL STANDARD

District courts have broad discretion in granting leave to participate as amicus curiae. Hoptowit v. Ray, 682 F.2d 1237, 1260 (9th Cir. 1982). While there is no specific rule on when such leave is proper, this discretion is liberally applied when the legal issues in a case "have potential ramifications beyond the parties directly involved." NGV Gaming, Ltd. v. Upstream Point Molate, LLC, 355 F. Supp. 2d 1061, 1067 (N.D. Cal. 2005). Indeed, the "classic role" of amicus curiae is filled in cases that involve the general public interest, including the interpretation and status of the law. Funbus Systems, Inc. v. State of Cal. Pub. Util.s Comm'n, 801 F.2d 1120, 1125 (9th Cir. 1986) (referencing Miller-Wohl Co. v. Commissioner of Labor & Industry, 694 F.2d 203, 204 (9th Cir. 1982)); Cmty. Ass'n for Restoration of the Env't. (CARE) v. DeRuyter Bros. Dairy, 54 F. Supp. 2d 974, 975 (E.D. Wash. 1999). Leave is also typically granted where the amicus has a "perspective that can help the court beyond the help that the lawyers for the parties are able to provide." CARE, 54 F. Supp. 2d at 975.

II. STATEMENT OF IDENTITY AND INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE

The current case involves allegations that the United States Secretary of Commerce, through a delegation of authority to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), violated the law by refusing to publish a final regulation related to the California drift gillnet fishery. The regulation, proposed by the Pacific Fishery Management Council, sought to reduce the amount of "bycatch" of protected

marine species, including endangered whales and sea turtles that frequent Washington waters.

Washington's interest in the resolution of this issue is significant. The regional fishery management councils are the only direct role that States have to shape federal fishery rules. Because Washington's fisheries are within the jurisdiction of the Pacific Council, Washington, through its designated regulatory agency, the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, is permanent member of the Pacific Council. In this capacity, Washington participated directly in crafting the proposed regulation at issue in this case. Washington, thus, has a vested interest in ensuring that NMFS properly adheres to the Magnuson-Stevens Act's procedures for review of regional councils' fishery management plans and implementing regulations—both as related to current drift gillnet regulation and other regulations that may be put forward by the Pacific Council in the future.

Washington and its residents also have a significant interest in benefits provided to the species targeted for protection by the proposed regulation. Many of the species vulnerable to bycatch under the California drift gillnet fishery are migratory in nature and frequent Washington waters, including humpback and sperm whales, sea turtles (leatherback, loggerhead, and green turtles), and a host of other marine animals. Because many of these species are listed as endangered or threatened under Washington State law, Washington expends significant resources on protecting these species and their habitat. These efforts are undermined by bycatch in the California drift gillnet fishery, particularly when Washington has for decades prohibited the use of drift gillnets in state coastal waters because of the adverse impacts of bycatch. As NMFS has acknowledged, the Pacific Council's rule—if implemented—will likely decrease bycatch rates. As a result, NMFS's reversal of its original affirmative decision on the proposed

regulation means that neither the anticipated reduction of bycatch of protected species, nor Washington's burden of protecting these species, will be lessened.

III. AMICUS CURIAE'S EXPERTISE WILL BENEFIT THE COURT

As a permanent member of the Pacific Fishery Management Council and a participant in crafting the regulation at issue in this case, Washington has considerable and specific knowledge regarding the California Drift Gillnet Fishery, its impacts to the Pacific coastal region, and the need to regulate the fishery to prevent unacceptable impacts to protected species. Additionally, as a participant in the Pacific Council since its inception, Washington also has valuable insight into the Magnuson-Stevens Act's de-centralized, regional approach to fisheries management as well as an understanding of how Congress has shaped the Magnuson-Stevens Act over the years to respond to shortcomings in fisheries policy. Because the named parties do not fully represent this perspective, Washington's proposed *amicus* brief provides unique context that will assist the Court. *See Funbus Systems, Inc.*, 801 F.2d at 1125; *CARE*, 54 F. Supp. 2d at 975.

Defendants in this case also take a broad read of the Magnuson-Stevens Act and its process for approving fisheries regulations drafted by regional councils. Defendants' reading, if adopted by this Court, would arguably apply to future regulations proposed by the Pacific Council. As a result, it is also especially important for the Court to consider Washington's view—as a permanent Pacific Council member—that Defendants' failure to act in this case directly contradicts Congress' intent that NMFS's review of proposed regulations not delay what a regional council views as necessary to implement a regional council's fishery management plan.

1	IV. CONCLUSION
2	For the foregoing reasons, the Washington respectfully requests this Court's
3	leave to file the attached amicus brief.
4	DATED this 27th day of August, 2018.
5	ROBERT W. FERGUSON
6	Attorney General of Washington
7	/s/ Kelly T. Wood
8	Kelly T. Wood (pro hac vice pending) Assistant Attorney General
9	Assistant Attorney General's Office Washington Attorney General's Office Counsel for Environmental Protection
10	800 5th Ave Ste. 2000 TB-14 Seattle, Washington 98104 (206) 326-5493
11	(206) 326-5493 Email: <u>kelly.wood@atg.wa.gov</u>
12	
13	DATED: August 27, 2018 KENDALL BRILL & KELLY LLP
14	
15	By: /a/ Lours W. Drill
16	By: /s/ Laura W. Brill Laura W. Brill (195889)
17	Special Assistant Attorney General Kendall Brill & Kelly LLP
18	10100 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 1725
19	Los Angeles, CA 90067 Telephone: 310.556.2700 Facsimile: 310.556.2705
20	lbrill@kbkfirm.com
21	Attorneys for the State of Washington
22	Attorneys for the state of washington
23	
24	
25	
26	